UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/724,728	12/02/2003	Terry M. Martin	200209048-1	2184

22879 7590 07/17/2006

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, PHILLIP H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/724,728	MARTIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phillip H. Nguyen	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 December 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20050203*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the original filing of December 02, 2003. Claims 1-31 are pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 1-7, 10-19, 22-24, 25-31 a re rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Briscoe et al (5,920,870).

4. Claim 1: Briscoe discloses a method of mapping and displaying process objects at different levels of abstraction, comprising:

a. Correlating business level objects to application level objects (Col 3, Line 10-35);

b. Associating and storing source data with indications for both the business level objects and the application level objects (Col 2, Line 50-67; Col 3, Line 1-10); and

c. Displaying the stored data associated with both business level objects and the application level objects (Fig. 4).

Claim 2: Briscoe discloses the method of mapping and displaying process objects at different levels of abstraction as in claim 1 above, and further discloses the step of correlating business level objects to application level objects comprises correlating objects at two or more levels of abstraction, wherein the business level objects corresponds to one level of abstraction and the application level objects corresponds to another level of abstraction (Fig 3; Col 3, Line 20-33).

Claim 3: Briscoe discloses the method as in claim 2 above, and further discloses the application level objects are further correlated application component level objects at another level of abstraction (Fig 3, Line 20-33).

Claim 4: Briscoe discloses the method of mapping and displaying process objects at different levels of abstraction as in claim 1 above, and further discloses the source data comprises application related data and operational data (Col 2, Line 50-67).

Claim 5: Briscoe discloses the method as in claim 4 above, and further discloses the application related data comprises data correlated to components of the application level objects (Fig 5).

Claim 6: Briscoe discloses the method as in claim 5 above, and further discloses the data correlated to the application level components comprises data collected by an

application conversation tracking tool or a custom designed instrumentation for measuring related data (Fig 3, items 64, 66, 68, 70).

Claim 7: Briscoe discloses the method as in claim 4 above, and further discloses the operational data comprises we session data or server related data (Col 6, Line 28-47).

Claim 10: Briscoe discloses a method of mapping and displaying process objects at different levels of abstraction as in claim 1 above, and further discloses the step of displaying the stored data associated with both the business level objects and the application level objects comprises filtering and/or aggregating the stored data responsive to a user's query (Col 9, Line 10-30).

Claim 11: Briscoe discloses the method as in claim 10 above, and further discloses the step of displaying the stored data associated with both business level objects and the application level objects comprises automatically generating alerts or reports based on predetermined criteria (Col 16, Line 32-40).

Claim 12: Briscoe discloses the method as in claim 11 above, and further discloses the predetermined criteria comprise one of a number of users accessing an object at any level of abstraction, a response time for web based interaction, or a

termination of a user session at a particular point in a web based interaction (Fig 8, item 44).

Claim 13: Briscoe discloses a method of mapping and displaying process objects at different levels of abstraction, comprising:

a. Correlating business level objects to application level objects (Col 3, Line 10-35);

b. Associating and storing source data with indications for both the business level objects and the application level objects (Col 2, Line 50-67; Col 3, Line 1-10); and

c. Displaying the stored data associated with both business level objects and the application level objects (Fig. 4).

Claim 14: Briscoe discloses the method of mapping and displaying process objects at different levels of abstraction as in claim 1 above, and further discloses the step of correlating business level objects to application level objects comprises correlating objects at two or more levels of abstraction, wherein the business level objects corresponds to one level of abstraction and the application level objects corresponds to another level of abstraction (Fig 3; Col 3, Line 20-33).

Claim 15: Briscoe discloses the method as in claim 2 above, and further discloses the application level objects are further correlated application component level objects at another level of abstraction (Fig 3, Line 20-33).

Claim 16: Briscoe discloses the method of mapping and displaying process objects at different levels of abstraction as in claim 1 above, and further discloses the source data comprises application related data and operational data (Col 2, Line 50-67).

Claim 17: Briscoe discloses the method as in claim 4 above, and further discloses the application related data comprises data correlated to components of the application level objects (Fig 5).

Claim 18: Briscoe discloses the method as in claim 5 above, and further discloses the data correlated to the application level components comprises data collected by an application conversation tracking tool or a custom designed instrumentation for measuring related data (Col 10, Line 47-67).

Claim 19: Briscoe discloses the method as in claim 4 above, and further discloses the operational data comprises we session data or server related data (Col 6, Line 28-47).

Claim 22: Briscoe discloses a method of mapping and displaying process objects at different levels of abstraction as in claim 1 above, and further discloses the step of displaying the stored data associated with both the business level objects and the application level objects comprises filtering and/or aggregating the stored data responsive to a user's query (Col 9, Line 10-30).

Claim 23: Briscoe discloses the method as in claim 10 above, and further discloses the step of displaying the stored data associated with both business level objects and the application level objects comprises automatically generating alerts or reports based on predetermined criteria (Col 16, Line 32-40).

Claim 24: Briscoe discloses the method as in claim 11 above, and further discloses the predetermined criteria comprise one of a number of users accessing an object at any level of abstraction, a response time for web based interaction, or a termination of a user session at a particular point in a web based interaction (Fig 8, item 144; Col 16, Line 41-58).

Claim 25: Briscoe discloses a system for mapping and displaying process objects at different levels of abstraction, comprising:

a. A model repository (memory space) that stores business level objects at one level of abstraction correlated to application level objects at another level of abstraction (Fig 1, Item 16);

b. A data conversion/storage (Database) unit that associates and stores source data with indications for both the business level objects and the application level objects (Fig 1B); and

c. A displaying unit (application interface) that displays the stored data associated with both the business level objects and the application level objects (Fig 1, Item 30; Fig 3; Fig 4).

Claim 26: Briscoe discloses the system as in claim 25 above, and further discloses the model repository further stores application component level objects at another level of abstraction that are correlated to the application level objects (Fig 1, Item 16; Col 4, Line 20-67; Col 5, Line 1-50).

Claim 27: Briscoe discloses the system as in claim 25 above, and further discloses the source data comprises application related data and operational data (Col 2, Line 50-67).

Claim 28: Briscoe discloses the system as in claim 27 above, and further discloses the application related data comprises data collected by an application conversation tracking tool or instrumentation from an application server and the operational data comprises we session related data collected from a web server or other server related data (Fig 3, Item 64, 66, 68, 70) (Col 10, Line 47-67).

Claim 29: Briscoe discloses the system as in claim 25 above, and further discloses the displaying unit comprises a configuration unit for displaying the stored data associated with both the business level objects and the application level objects by filtering and/or aggregating the stored data responsive to a user's query (Col 9, Line 10-30).

Claim 30: Briscoe discloses the system for mapping and displaying process object at different levels of abstraction as in claim 25 above, and further discloses the displaying unit comprises logic for displaying stored data associated with both business level objects and the application level objects automatically as alerts or reports based on predetermined criteria (Col 16, Line 32-40).

Claim 31: Briscoe discloses a system for mapping and displaying process objects at different levels of abstraction comprising:

a. Means for correlating business level objects to application level objects (Col 3, Line 10-35);

b. Means for associating and storing source data with both the business level objects and the application level objects (Col 2, Line 50-67; Col 3, Line 1-10); and

c. Means for displaying the stored data associated with both the business level objects and the application level objects (Fig 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 8, 9, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Briscoe (US 5,920,870) in view of Bowman-Amuah (US 6,289,382).

7. Claim 8: Briscoe discloses a method as in claim 7 above and the server related data comprises server load data, but does not explicitly disclose the web session data comprises response times for web based interactions. However, Bowman-Amuah discloses the web session data comprises response times for web-based interactions (Col 225, Line 35-66; Col 226, Line 1-10). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to consider the response times for the web based interaction. Because the speed with which a user interface can respond to a user initiated request is important attribute of every application. Therefore, One would have been motivated to provide response times for the web-based interaction necessary to support the transaction between client server applications.

Claim 9: Briscoe and Bowman-Amuah disclose a method as in claim 8 above. Bowman-Amuah further discloses the response times for web-based interactions are correlated to application component level objects, application level objects, and business level objects (Fig 3; Col 18, Line 30-67). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the response time for web based interactions correlate to application component level objects, application level objects, and business level objects because these three levels objects are correlated to each other. In a multiple level abstractions environment, each query must travel from business level to application level and to application component level and even lower levels of abstractions across a network. The result of the query must travel all the way back to the client. Therefore, one would have been motivated to consider having the response times for the web-based interaction correlate to application component level objects, application level objects, and business level objects to monitor response times for a web based interactions.

Claim 20: Briscoe discloses a method as in claim 19 above and the server related data comprises server load data, but does not explicitly disclose the web session data comprises response times for web based interactions. However, Bowman-Amuah discloses the web session data comprises response times for web-based interactions (Col 225, Line 35-66; Col 226, Line 1-10). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to consider the response times for the web based interaction. Because the speed with

which a user interface can respond to a user initiated request is important attribute of every application. Therefore, One would have been motivated to provide response times for the web-based interaction necessary to support the transaction between client server applications.

Claim 21: Briscoe and Bowman-Amuah disclose a method as in claim 20 above. Bowman-Amuah further discloses the response times for web-based interactions are correlated to application component level objects, application level objects, and business level objects (Fig 3; Col 18, Line 30-67). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the response time for web based interactions correlate to application component level objects, application level objects, and business level objects because these three levels objects are correlated to each other. In a multiple level abstractions environment, each query must travel from business level to application level and to application component level and even lower levels of abstractions across a network. The result of the query must travel all the way back to the client. Therefore, one would have been motivated to consider having the response times for the web-based interaction correlate to application component level objects, application level objects, and business level objects to monitor response times for a web based interactions.

CONCLUSION

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Reddy et al (US 6,986,120) discloses system and apparatus for programming system view in an object oriented environment.

b. Bowman-Amuah (US 6,256,773) discloses system, method and article of manufacture for configuration management in a development architecture.

c. Bowman-Amuah (US 6,289,382) discloses system, method and article of manufacture for a globally addressable interface in a communication services patterns environment.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 270-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10:00 AM - 3:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Myhre can be reached on (571) 270-1065. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

P.N

PN
7/5/2006

James W. Myhre
Supervisory Patent Examiner